

## **REMARKS**

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on September 17, 2008. Claims 1-11, 13-26 and 28-31 are currently pending, of which, Claims 1, 15, 17, 23 and 31 are in independent form. Claims 17, 23 and 28 have been amended.

### **I. Rejection of Claims 1-9**

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,873,841 ("Sagar") in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 09294158 A ("Wakabayashi"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As admitted by the Examiner, Sagar "does not specifically disclose a cellular phone wherein the remote central station storing a plurality of telephone directories each assigned a unique identification code and assigned to the transmitted unique identification code to the received telephone directory, *wherein said telephone directory including a listing created and transmitted to the remote central station using a computing device not corresponding to a subscriber of the cellular telephone.*" (Emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that Wakabayashi does not address at least the emphasized limitations shown above which the Examiner indicates are not disclosed by Sagar. Wakabayashi is directed to a facsimile system having storage means for storing a plurality of telephone directory files and retrieval means for retrieving a prescribed telephone directory file from the storage means.

There is no disclosure or suggestion by Wakabayashi that one or more of the plurality of telephone directory files stored by the storage means of the facsimile system includes a listing

*created and transmitted* to the storage means using a computing device *not corresponding to a subscriber of a cellular telephone*.

It is known that in a traditional facsimile system, as that described by Wakabayashi, telephone directory files are created using a keypad or other peripheral device of the facsimile system prior to being storing within a memory of the facsimile system. It is also known, therefore, that telephone directory files for facsimile systems, as that described by Wakabayashi, do not include any telephone directory listings created and transmitted to a memory storage of the facsimile system using a computing device not corresponding to a subscriber of a cellular telephone. Accordingly, in the facsimile system described by Wakabayashi, the telephone directory files are not created using a computing device, and therefore, are not transmitted to the facsimile system using the computing device or another computing device not corresponding to a subscriber of a cellular telephone as required by Applicants' independent Claim 1.

In particular, there is no disclosure or suggestion by Wakabayashi of the following limitation recited by Applicants' independent Claim 1: “said telephone directory including at least one telephone directory listing *created and transmitted* to the remote central station *using a computing device not corresponding to a subscriber of the cellular telephone*.”

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to independent Claim 1 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-9 depend from independent Claim 1 and therefore contain all of the features of independent Claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above for the patentability of Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-9 are also patentable. Accordingly,

withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Claims 2-9 and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

## **II. Rejection of Claims 10-11 and 13-14 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 10-11 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sagar and Wakabayashi, further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040203579 (“Comp”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10-11 and 13-14 depend from independent Claim 1 and therefore contain all of the features of independent Claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above for the patentability of Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 10-11 and 13-14 are also patentable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Claims 10-11 and 13-14 and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

## **III. Rejection of Claims 15-16 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sagar in view of U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0094806 (“Kamimura”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As admitted by the Examiner, Sagar “does not specifically disclose a cellular telephone comprising parsing Caller ID information, said caller ID information including at least a telephone number and an entity assigned the telephone number, and storing the parsed Caller ID information as a telephone directory listing within the telephone directory, wherein the processor creates the telephone directory listing using the caller ID information and stores the telephone directory listing within the memory.” This language is recited by Applicants’ independent Claim 15.

It is respectfully submitted that Kamimura does not address at least the limitations recited above which the Examiner indicates are not disclosed by Sagar. The Examiner refers to paragraph 3 and figure 1 of Kamimura in rejecting Applicants' Claim 15. Paragraph 3 of Kamimura states as follows:

Radio communication apparatuses, for example, cellular phones, can send and receive short text messages or electronic mail (e-mail). In addition, cellular phones can store a calling party's telephone number and name corresponding to caller ID information in a telephone directory. In addition, cellular phones can store a message address or an e-mail address in a telephone directory in correspondence with the calling party's telephone number.

The Examiner relies on paragraph 3 for stating that cellular phones can store a calling party's telephone number and name corresponding to caller ID information in a telephone directory. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion in paragraph 3, figure 1 or elsewhere in Kamimura of *parsing* Caller ID information and storing the *parsed* Caller ID information as a telephone directory listing within a telephone directory, as recited by Applicants' Claim 15. In particular, Kamimura does not disclose or suggest "a set of instructions capable of being executed by the processor for: parsing Caller ID information, said Caller ID information including at least a telephone number and an entity assigned the telephone number; and storing the parsed Caller ID information as a telephone directory listing within the telephone directory, wherein the processor creates the telephone directory listing using the Caller ID information and stores the telephone directory listing within the memory," as recited by Applicants' Claim 15.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that in view of the arguments presented above, independent Claim 15 is allowable over Sagar in view of Kamimura. Accordingly, withdrawal

of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and allowance of independent Claim 15 are respectfully requested.

Claim 16 depends from independent Claim 15 and therefore contains all of the features of independent Claim 15. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above for the patentability of Claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 16 is also patentable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Claim 16 and allowance of this claim are respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Rejection of Claims 17-20, 22-23, 26 and 28-29**

Claims 17-20, 22-23, 26 and 28-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Comp in view of Wakabayashi.

As admitted by the Examiner, Comp “does not specifically disclose identifying at least a portion of a telephone directory of the plurality of telephone directories stored by the remote central station and corresponding to at least one of the plurality of cellular telephones and transferring at least the identified portion of the telephone directory to at least two of the plurality of cellular telephones.” This language is quoted by the Examiner from Applicants’ Claim 17.

The Examiner states that Wakabayashi addresses the deficiencies of Comp.

Applicants have amended Claim 17 to further clarify the above cited claim language by adding the following: “wherein the identified portion of the telephone directory includes at least one telephone directory listing created and transmitted to the remote central station using a computing device not corresponding to a subscriber of at least one of the at least two of the plurality of cellular telephones.” It is further respectfully submitted that Wakabayashi does not disclose or suggest these features now recited by Applicants’ Claim 17.

As discussed above, it is known that in a traditional facsimile system, as that described by Wakabayashi, telephone directory files are created using a keypad or other peripheral device of the facsimile system prior to being storing within a memory of the facsimile system. It is also known, therefore, that telephone directory files for facsimile systems, as that described by Wakabayashi, do not include any telephone directory listings created and transmitted to a memory storage of the facsimile system using a computing device not corresponding to a subscriber of a cellular telephone. Accordingly, in the facsimile system described by Wakabayashi, the telephone directory files are not created using a computing device, and therefore, are not transmitted to the facsimile system using the computing device or another computing device not corresponding to a subscriber of at least two of a plurality of cellular telephones as required by Applicants' independent Claim 17.

Claim 23 has been amended to recite similar features as those added to Claim 17.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that in view of the arguments presented above, independent Claims 17 and 23 are allowable over Comp in view of Wakabayashi. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and allowance of independent Claims 17 and 23 are respectfully requested.

Claims 18-20, 22, 26, and 28-29 depend from independent Claims 1, 17 and 23 and therefore contain all of the features of independent Claims 1, 17 and 23. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above for the patentability of Claims 1, 17 and 23, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 5, 7, 20 and 30 are also patentable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Claims 5, 7, 20 and 30 and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

#### **V. Rejection of Claims 21 and 24-25**

Claims 21 and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Comp and Wakabayashi, and further in view of Sagar. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 21 and 24-25 depend from independent Claims 17 and 23, respectively, and therefore contains all of the features of independent Claims 17 and 23. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented for the patentability of Claims 17 and 23, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 21 and 24-25 are also patentable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Claims 21 and 24-25 and allowance of these claim are respectfully requested.

#### **VI. Rejection of Claim 30**

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Comp and Wakabayashi, and further in view of Brown. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 30 depends from independent Claim 23, and therefore contains all of the features of independent Claim 23. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented for the patentability of Claim 23, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 30 is also patentable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Claim 30 and allowance of this claim are respectfully requested.


It is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the claims is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview may facilitate prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number indicated below.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the application and allowance of Claims 1-11, 13-26 and 28-30 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'G. Likourezos', written over a horizontal line.

George Likourezos

Reg. No. 40,067

Attorney for Applicants

Carter, DeLuca, Farrell & Schmidt, LLP  
445 Broad Hollow Road  
Suite 420  
Melville, New York 11747  
631-501-5706  
FAX: 631-501-3526